DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 003 HE 000 270

By-Whittaker, David

Student Subcultures Reviewed and Revisited.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Pub Date Jul 68

Note-27p.; Paper presented to Conference of National Association of Student Personnel Administration, Berkeley, California, July 1-4, 1968.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45

Descriptors-*Environmental Influences, *Higher Education, *Individual Development, Peer Groups, Self Concept, Social Factors, Student Alienation, Student Behavior, *Student Characteristics, *Student Subcultures

Studies conducted between 1956 and 1966 indicate that what students learn in college is determined by an interaction of individuality and norms common to peer groups, and that identification of individual characteristics leads to the discovery of student subcultures. An important developmental stage during late adolescence is the consolidation of identity. In today's era of social change, a student finds individual development difficult because he may resist roles already accepted by society, and college environments may or may not help him in his search for a self-fulfilling role. A student's personality and his sharing of perceptions and values of the world with others links him to a subculture group. A comparison of subculture groups at different campuses was made--based on personality types and the extent to which students identified with their respective institutions -- in order to identify important attributes that produce a common environment or set of values. Findings reveal that (1) 90% of college students value college in terms of social and monetary gains--the degree is more important than the education it is supposed to reflect, (2) some subgroups form through residential proximity or family social status and others through major fields of study, and (3) there are two major forms of subcultural deviant behavior: political activists (who confront society) and disaffiliates (who withdraw from society); both are considered as alienated groups seeking distinctive identities. (WM)

ED 026003

NASPA Conference
July 1-4, 1968
Berkeley

Student Subcultures Reviewed and Revisited

David Whittaker
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

"The determinants and dynamics, the form, of student subcultures are as diverse as the concepts and data within the growing body of knowledge within the social sciences, thus the many facets of reality."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 278

Student Subcultures Reviewed and Revisited

David Whittaker
CRDHE, UC, Berkeley

As a social psychologist interested in higher education I occasionally attempt to escape to a seemingly simpler world by reading, for example, books written during the twenties about collegiate life. However, those sophisticated authors insightfully able to see beyond the contemporary sterotypes of the day allude to underlying social and psychological factors that have a familiar ring. It is at such times that one again realizes the continuity of probelms. I was also interested, by the way, in noticing that a number of deans of students who had authored such books referred to their daily work in such terms as "the practice of an unhappy profession." Deans have something in common with Catherine the Great of Russia. After listening to the impressive, and liberal, theories of a famous French philosopher, it was she who siad "Monsieur Diderot, you write on paper but I, poor empress, must write on human skin." While few of us can claim to be in the elite category of a Diderot, researchers are, by definition, writers on paper and I appreciate your position in dealing with the daily realities of the world of students.

Student subcultures have received increasing emphasis as an area for research in higher education because previous studies (Freedman, 1956; Jacob, 1957; Newcomb and Wilson, 1966) have left no doubt that what students do learn and find significant in college is determined, or even pre-determined, in a very large measure by the basically extracurricular interaction of their individuality and the norms that prevail in their peer groups and <u>not</u> by their curricular work per se.

Secondly, the task of understanding students, let alone 6,000,000 of them, as complicated human beings, operating in equally complex social-psychological environments, is somewhat more manageable by identifiable subcultures conceived as broad patterns of differing orientations to be subcategorized and studied in as much detail as deemed warranted.

Having recently been involved with the initiation of a longitudinal study of college student subcultures on several differing campuses and their implications for higher education, a basic task was, and continues to be, reviewing the literature. It is really only in this last decade that material explicity focusing upon aspects of student subcultures have become available both in growing number and quality. This fact, along with the large and increasing body of knowledge in the social sciences tangentially related to such a broad subject as student culture (as well as the historic realities of campus life today) has led to an increased appreciation of the complexities of the area rather than, perhaps, understanding per se.

It was necessary in our proposed research to be eclectic in our approach to the subject in order to avoid the bias often inherent in singular points of view. The relatively narrow focus, however, although limiting, remains a necessary modus operandi that stimulates and complements broad, integrative research which presently must tolerate a good deal of ambiguity.

There is no general theory of subculture. However, in order to conceptualize the dynamics of subcultural phenomena, the implicit, if not explicit, approach of all researchers is based on the psychogenic assumption that all human behavior, by individuals or by groups, is an ongoing series of efforts to cope with problems. "Problems," or situations, of course, are widely defined ranging from those resulting in extreme, and often unresolved, tension to those that imply little or no anxiety and which are familiar, recurrent and readily solved by habitual modes of action. A culture or subculture, student or otherwise, then, can be simply defined in terms of the similarity of confrontations (problems), the shared values (or sets of understandings and agreements) and resulting coping behavior on the part of individuals. As you know, in reality neither the definition of the parameters nor the dynamics of a subculture is a simple matter. If you want to describe, explain, predict or even, God help us, to manipulate to some degree what students do within a particular

subculture, then we want to be very clear about the social-psychological nature of their human problems and behavior and the degree of commonality within the membership. It is logically recognized that all the multifarious factors that conspire to produce, and thus understand, a cubculture come from two sources and their interaction--the group's frame of reference and the situation the members confront. This dichotomy generally becomes blurred, because of interaction, but it is often helpful to keep the distinction in mind.

I would like now to give a review not so much of the overwhelming number of findings directly or indirectly concerning student subcultures, which cannot be summarized here, but of the more generally appreciated approaches, classification and variables present in the literature that should be taken into intergrative account. I offer this review of conceptual approaches to reemphasize the need to be continually cognizant of the many interrelated facets of reality in research related to student subculture.

Cross-cultural Studies

First, mention must be made of cross-cultural research. As one approach to comparative, international studies, the Cambridge sociologist Hopper (1966) has conceptualized a system for the classification of institutionalized educational systems. Based on the ideologies of student selection--when? who? how? why?--the four continua are cross-tabulated to present a categorizing paradigm that places the U.S.S.R. at one extreme and Canada and U.S. at the other extreme (we are basically classified as having a meritocratic ideology, an individualistic form of universalism) with various clusters such as France and Sweden, and Germany and Australia, significantly spaced intermittently. The similarities and differences between contrasting national student cultures, and the variety and proportion of subcultural groupings, are interesting approaches and such studies are growing in numbers. In a rather anthropological way, such research often confirms subcultural theoretical attempts.

Institutional Character and Environmental Assessment

The general environment, the character, of different institutions is obviously diverse and it is equally obvious that such a complex situational variable must be considered as directly affecting student subculture in an active, and reactive, manner. Our capacity in social research to identify and contrast the ramifications of institutional character has not proceeded much past conventional wisdom. The available methodological short-cuts, usually in questionnaire or rating lists, only begin to scratch the surface. Nevertheless, the identification of the major characteristics of an institution's setting, plant, curriculum, authority structure, faculty and student body, its historic perspective (image) and its socio-economic base are ascertainable and influential. For example, Casebeer (1963) has shown the relationship between administrative climate of American colleges classified simply as autocratic, democratic or laissez-faire, and the pattern of student values which, in term, was related to subcultural expression. The relationship was considered causal.

Although there are some exceptions, most studies of institutional character or environment are studies of student characteristics in that students are used as subjects. Either students are described in terms of their intersts and behavior, both academic and personal, or students are asked to give their perception of their college environment. Centra (1968) correlated a national sample of student Scholastic Aptitude Test, Verbal and Math, scores with the Pace's College and University Environment scores for each institution surveyed and, predictably, noted an overall strong positive correlation (.67) between the academic input and the Intellectual press scales of CUES. Thus, such data indicate that for any particular institution those measurements have possible ramifications for student culture. However, looking at those institutions where the correlation was particularly low, colleges with high Intellectual environment scores

relative to low SAT scores tended to be located in the midwest whereas those with lower intellectual environment scores than expected from their relatively higher SAT scores were located in the northeast. Aside from the validity of the instrument, different "frames of references," standards of comparison, appear to be in operation that are geographical in nature. This fact raises problems of comparison.

Environmental scales are rough measures but continue to be used as useful indications of student culture and subculture orientations. The 300 items of the Junior College Environment Scales has recently been factor analyzed (Hendrix, 1963). Four main dimensions appeared: Conventional Conformity describes a campus community resembling Tonnies" (1940) Gemeinschaft society--well-established standards and ideals which create a desciplined and traditional social structure; Internalization, an environment that stressing awareness of issues and problems of the day; Maturation, environmental presses emphasizing independent and logical reasoning in order to develop internal motivation toward the practical adult world; and Humanism, describes a student membership interested in involvement with the ideas and theories in the social sciences, humanities and arts, and almost no emphasis on social or athletic activities. Again, such data will relate descriptively to various "output" indices, student attitudes and activities, and are clues to student subculture.

Kells (1968) at the year's annual meeting of the Ass. for Institutional Research voiced concern that a significant trend in higher education, the development of the cluster or residential college, is progressing in a largely unexamined fashion. This criticism was partically met by Gaff, (1968). A highly innovative, cluster cluster college was compared with its more traditionally structured main campus using student responses on environmental scales in order to assess the degree to which the new college had provided an increased personalized and intellectually stimulating climate. Not only were the

innovations of the new campus apparently successful but the environmental measures indicated characteristics not unlike some of the most productive liberal arts colleges in the country. This particular cluster college and its more conventional parent campus are both included in the institutions under study by our Center and their differing institutional character, directly affecting student culture, is now being related to the differing student clique and subcultural formations.

The Entering Student and His Background

The difference in the institutional character of the two campuses just mentioned in Gaff's study also necessitates an emphasis on the importance of the differing characteristics of their student body as fundamentally involved in the resulting environmental atmosphere and its subcultural ramifications. A college can shape the characteristics of its student body (and in turn be shaped by them) in two general ways: through its influence on its students, while they are enrolled, i.e. its impact, and through the kinds of students it attracts, recruits, admits and retains. McConnell and Heist (1961) have pointed out not only the diversity in a given institution's student body but the striking differences between institutions in respect to their student population. (College image, student choice and admittance.) Both contrasts reflect predispositional factors affecting subculture. Thus the existing culture is important to define really in terms as to how it socialized individuals into particular roles-patterns (see peer group influence) given the background of the entering students.

Research that follows the distinction between student quality and institutional influence unfortunately tends to assume that the characteristics of entering students are independent of the specific nature of the college the students attend. Nevertheless, the study of student characteristics at point of entry allows us to focus on certain categories of students in which we are particularly interested, e.g., the potential scholars.

The determinants of the form of student subcultures are as diverse as the concepts and data within the growing body of knowledge within the social sciences. As "facts" reflect the questions asked and thus answers sought, it is advisable to be aware of the kinds of questions that are applicable to understanding the many views of such a sociopsychological concept as the particular origins and expressions, the dynamics, of student subcultures.

The effects of a student's precollege background must be appreciated, if not understood, in its totality as a developing and unique person and the possible resulting interaction with totality of the college environment. The influential mix of nature-nurture lies in understanding the individual case history and then combine data for subcultural generalizations. Predispositions to, or propensity for, entrance and interaction with subgroups remains a major factor (and research approach) in conjunction with the availability of attracting peer groups. In terms of student personality and background description at time of entrance, which is often very incomplete, researchers, nevertheless, can often get some indication of major characteristics, values and beliefs, attitudes, emotional adjustment etc.--in short, what are the <u>foundations</u> for further development and experiences. Each sociological and psychological variable that can be measured and added into the data pool, however complicated the resulting admixture, the closer the appreciation of reality and the probability of isolating significant factors for individuals and themes or trends in group analysis. Basic, highly focused, research on, for example socio-economic factors, ethnicity, religious affiliation, sex differences, and personality variables such as achievement motivation and the authoritarian and creativity syndrom, are well know indices and often help to fundamentally explain, in conjunction with other variables, individual and group behavior, subcultural entrance and dynamics.

Development and Identity

In agreement with a number of theorists, it is postulated that the crucial or primary developmental task of late adolsecence is the consolidation of identity. The term identity has unfortunately become a cliché but the concept remains of basic importance in the individual psychology of youth, and, in the conglomerate, in the dynamics of their subcultures. It is surprisingly easy for adults, even for those who professionally must deal with youth, to often lose sight of this adolescent need and have little respect, or tolerance, for the complexities of identity seeking strivings, especially when they take so called "deviant" forms.

During the college years, identity assumes considerable importance for a variety of reasons especially if the concept is simply defined as "what the individual is or is becoming" in both the objective and particularly the subjective, or phenomenological, sense, that is, from the individual's own point of view. Identity becomes significant for a college student because of a possible change in reference groups, and offering varying possibilities for experience. While, in many cases, exposing students to a large number of alternative roles, college also allows a "breathing" period for the adjustment to adulthood. The college environment, like the variety of environments available to non-collegiate youth, may or may not be conducive to particular individuals as the best place to experience what Erikson (1959) calls the psychosocial moratorium on adulthood. Nevertheless, explorations with new roles are often provided in an atmosphere of both freedom and protection, thereby allowing the individuals to "try on" a number of different roles on behavior which might well have been punished, or punished more severly, in a non-university environment. During the college years it is expected that many students will pass through a stage of conflict or crisis relative to adult acceptance by (or complete alienation from) their parents and/or society in their strivings for independence.[1]

---

[1]The above summarization based on a resume by Floyd, CRDHE.

The developmental level of maturity, before and during college, in interaction with their particular socio-psycholgical needs and the environmental opportunities, leads to the finding of a role or roles to implement identity needs. This overt behavior, a reflection of inner direction, is also subculturally projected and the best indications we have of the range and extent of student needs and coping mechanisms in terms of student population at large. Among modern youth, identity formations often do not fit the commonly utilized roles. This is to be expected in time of social change which, in turn, is affected by the problem of identity vs. roles of such youth. The individual's developmental task is thus difficult today and sometimes the longest time for the achievement of such a resolution is needed by the most sensitive, astute and intelligent of our youth who usually take the job more seriously.

The major reaction to this situation is an increase in feelings of alienation, another important concept unfortunately a cliché, and frustration with regard to self and/or society. Alienation, as a feeling of out of touchness, with oneself, with others, with one's environment or society, or even with the contemporary period in which one lives, leads to a reaction of withdrawal, and/or resistance to, roles that society offers but are perceived as "non-fitting" by such youth.

The sociological view of personality and development is based on two assumptions. First, a person's perception of his world, like his perception of himself, is not a consequence of his personality, but from a sociological view, it <u>is</u> his personality. Secondly, the individual's perception of the world is not completely idiosyncratic. Persons occupying the same niche socially are likely to share many similar perceptions and values. Thus the sociological impetus towards a classification of subcultural groups.

Subculture Typologies

Student culture is not monolithic although research in the area occasionally regards it as a homogeneous culture for certain purposes such as gross comparisons of one campus to another in order to identify the important attributes that produce a general, common environment or set of values. There is a plurality of heterogeneous subgroups valuing different interests and rewarding different activities. Thus a number of student subgroupings may be distinguished and they may range from a large and amorphous subculture through to more or less formal student groups to clique formations.

Socialogists Clark and Trow's (1960, 1966) rationally derived typology of student subgroupings is fairly well known and basic to an initial approach to the area. The theoretical identification of student's subcultures is based on two variables: the degree (high or low) to which students are involved with ideas and the extent to which students identify with their institution. By dichotomizing the two demensions, four orientations, or subcultures, emerged. The Academics, highly involved in the world of ideas and high identification with their college via the faculty, regard education as scholarly pursuit of knowledge and cultivation of the intellect in accord with official curriculum; and the Nonconformists, high on "ideas" but low on attachment to or identification with their college, pursue their interest generally outside of the curriculum via off-campus reference groups, regard education as a search for personal meaning and individual fulfillment, and are often critical of many aspects of their education and of present day society. The remaining two other orientations are not particularly involved with the world of ideas. The Collegiate, resistant or indifferent to serious intellectual demands, are strongly attached to their institution via the values and activities associated with the social, extracurricular aspects of college life; and the Vocational, committed neither to ideas nor the college, emphasize

educational experiences as occupational preparation.

Clark and Trow were explicit in stating that their subcultural categories did not necessarily represent types of students even though in practice they often do, and that most subcultures are a fluid system of norms and values which overlap and flow into each other due to the marginal and/or multiple membership of individual students. Also, although the term subculture implies that students share the same set of values and modes of behavior, they may or may not be aware of their own, and shared, orientation, and they may or may not know and interact with each other.

Recently, other investigators empirically have generated student or subcultural typologies that both parallel and extend the Clark-Trow orientations. Pemberbton (1963) subdivides Academic into Academic-theoretical where the primary orientation towards ideas are motivated by intellectual freedom and challenge and Academic Conformity where the primary intellectual attitudes tend towards grade-making and respect for traditional academic authority and requirements. He also adds an extra orientation that Clark and Trow do not handle, that of Social-Service, preference, generally, for such fields of study coupled with the disposition to understand the the motives of others, to sympathize and put into practical motion efforts to serve others.

Newcomb et al (1967) subcategorized the Nonconformist category which Clark and Trow admitted was their leasr satisfactory orientation in their four fold scheme, being something of a residual category. They noted the Creative Individualists, the Wild Ones (high individualism and low intellectuality) and Political Activists. Leaders, those having a strong preference for heading organizations and committees, for the leadership positions per se rather than the particular aims or goals, were another category they indentified that did not fit into the Clark-Trow model.

Warren's (1968) typology extends the Clark-Trow scheme and by factor analysis overcomes some of the limitations imposed by its categorical nature and the resulting ambiguities that can occur when their clarification is applied. He reclassified Nonconformity rather similarly to Newcomb's three divisions and also notes the Leader orientation. However, he adds the Uncommitted and Undirected orientations. Here, the large numbers of apathetic students might be seen as displaying evasiveness as a response to structural ambivalence. Schumer and Stanfield (1966) similarly identified the empirical major typologies, previously mentioned, by factor analysis of behavioristic items to classify types of student role orientations. They also noted a Ritualistic role, which they define as an orientation more strongly directed to home than the university and a preference for solitary activity and inactivity--the loner--which, by definition, is a subculture of non-interacting membership types.

Thus, the examples given, and others, confirm empirically much of the basic Clark and Trow schemata for college students as well as elaborate upon these categories, suggest several additional orientations, and, in general, overcome ambiguities by such refinements.

Of the body of data that is beginning to accumulate relatively little empirical work has been done at the junior college level, although such students are now growing greatly in numbers (indeed, in California, they are the most numerous kind of college students). Mauss (1967) applied the Clark-Trow subculture typology but altered the "identification with the College" dimension to "Identification with the adult community" as junior colleges are virtually always "commuter" campuses and students have little commitment to their cmapus as a significant environment. Retaining the other dimension of involvment with ideas, the four theoretical subcultural types developed correspond to the Clark-

Trow orientations: Academic, Incipient Rebel, Vocational and Perpetual Teenager. Although aware of the danger of oversimplification and "pigeonholing," the data indicated that the typology appeared to differentiate the junior college student rather clearly. Because of the commuter aura of such campuses, the terms must not imply anything as concrete as structured peer groups but only different normative patterns of behavior, although they are climates within which peer groups can form. He noted that, in California, the "environmental press" at most junior colleges is dominated by the Vocational and Perpetual Teenager orientations. Indeed, the Teenagers alone comprised nearly half of his sample (junior colleges generally must admit all applicants). He also noted that of the 10% falling in the academic subcultures, 3/4 of the students were female, although more than half of the total student population was male (reflecting a greater willingness of parents to send academically talented boys to other institutions).

Peer Groups

Generally, most studies that use some form of student classification base their findings in terms of some objective categories (such as subcultural orientation) rather than membership, and the internal dynamics, in an interacting group. The complex workings of the college peer group, its formation and the amount of influence it has on individuals depends upon many conditions (Newcomb and Wilson, 1966) but the important, basic functions it performs must be taken into account in any subcultural research on college students. The peer group acts, of course, as part of the intermediate social environment between the family and the large college, and societal, world. The peer group may help the individual student through the crisis of achieving independence from home. Emotional support is offered and needs not satisfied by curriculum, classroom or faculty are met as well as the occasion for practice in socialization with

others of both similar and different orientation. Through value reinforcement, the peer group can provide support for not changing just as it can challenge old values and encourage change via new experiences. Reliance on peers for values, experience and guidance can lead to relationships that are both instructive and destructive--especially as it provides for escape (the necessary alternative to academic effort). This is particularly true for the student who is dissatisfied with college or who is unsuccessful academically, as a peer group relationship may be the main source of gratification and positive self-image support.

Most students, especially when seen in personal interview, appear to be deeply involved in trying to understand themselves and relate to, or avoid, others. This absorbs much time and energy and affects their academic and intellectual activities. Yet colleges appear to show relatively little interest in the individual's social development (there is a need for specialized encounter groups for the socially inhibited). Related to this socialization, Austin (1968) noted the important clue that students who requested their roommates withdrew less than those who did not have such requests.

Our research is confirming the expectation that personality types do tend to form an interacting subculture but the findings pointed to the insulating function of the subculture--the fact that many students appear less likely to expose themselves to the influence of students whose values were dissimilar to their own. The fact of proximity, often a chance factor, is also significant here. Heist (1963) noted, as we too are finding, that for sophomores significant peer group experiences for numerous students occurred within the immediate acquaintances of a dormitory floor or hall. For many the impact of so-called student culture of the large campus was of minimal consequence. In respect to this phenomenon of peer group importance in the lives of many students (the source of "significant others" in terms of major educational and personal

influences) and insulation from others, we repeatedly observed two different trends, or types, of students in referring to others who were identified by the subject as being very different from themselves. There were those who wanted to get to know those "other" people better. And there were those who saw such others as negative role models, i.e., they saw themselves as not at all like the "negative peer" and a personal confirmation in their own values takes place, or they were made aware of the same negative aspects in their own life and they resolved to attempt to overcome such elements. Both these attitudes were noted, for example, by both "straight" and "non-conformist" students in reference to each other.

Changers and Non-Changers and the Impact of College

The above observation leads to the rather dichotomized continua of the concept of student types who change and grow, and those who tend to be non-changers in terms of the tolerance and liberalizing values a college education is assumed to give. The particular emphasis exerted by individual students or by the pervasive positions taken by the generalized student body of a particular campus seems directly to affect the mode of the subculture experssion and must be taken into account.

Students have a tendency to develop in certain seemingly predisposed ways. Heist (1961) suggested that the die is cast with respect to changers and non-changers before entrance into college and the impact of the college environment is a secondary factor in affecting outcome. He concludes that the non-changers can be "trained" but are not easily "educated," i.e., given an effective liberalized education. The changers, or "developers," often potential scholars, need the stimulation and interaction of other motivated peers as well as environmental diversity, whereas such is not demanded by non-changers.

The effects of the manipulation of students and environment, and the effects of student mix, is not well understood.

Research has shown that general changes do take place over four years of college. Thinking Introversion and Non-authoritarianism on the OPI, for example, tends to increase (Cross, 1968) and increased differentiation over time is noted for all six values of the AVL - a heightening of interests takes place, particularly on the Theoretical value (Newcomb and Feldman, 1968). Major field of study, however, remains a factor that differentiates subgroups.

Regan and Yonge (1968) noted that students in the Vocational subcultural orientation limit, or are limited in, their growth in intellectual-scholarly values as measured by the OPI, whereas the Self-expressive group expand their growth on such values and prefer a variety of experiences. The Vocational group tended to be lower on Complexity and higher on Practical Outlook as freshmen than the freshman Self-expressive group. The differences between the two groups were in the same direction, but even greater, when measured as seniors with the Self-expressive group being particularly higher on Complexity and lower on Practicality.

Jacob (1957) concluded that the impact of college experience on value change, as Heist (1961) did in reference to non-changers, is very minimal - especially that which can be attributed to curriculum. The impact has been the socialization of the individual into the ranks of alumni rather than a liberalization of student values. Newcomb and Feldman (1968), a decade later, found it necessary to pose the question of impact in more specific and complex ways and concluded that college does have an impact and not the least upon their values.

It has been estimated (Duggan, 1968) that probably as many as 90% of college students are neither the intellectually committed nor the intellectually

disadvantaged, but the "untouched." These are the students, extrinsically motivated at best, who value college only in terms of outside social and monetary gains. They refuse to take the responsibility for the direction of their own education, i.e., the acquiring of the degree is more important than the education it is supposed to reflect. Katz (1967) similarly concludes on a depressing note in reference to a longitudinal study of Berkeley and Stanford students. For most students, academic-intellectual life does not adequately connect with their own motivations; they have not learned to use their reasoning capacities to solve or face problems concerning their own development nor have they attained an autonomous identity.

Deviance and Alienation

Pressures towards conformity to the normative patterns traditionally current on many campuses may protect particular students and also may dampen or destroy the efforts of others at self-direction and self-exploration. The notion of conformity leads, of course, to a consideration of deviations from the norm. This deviance is usually defined by the minority position in terms of who applies the deviant label to whom, but it works both ways.

The pressures to accommodate the peer group norms, whether they be defined as conformist or deviant to conventional mores, are strong and in both cases the rewards are Biblical in their simplicity - acceptance, recognition and respect. The process of thus identifying with a group involves individuals permitting themselves to become progressively committed only as others, by some visible sign, become, or are, likewise committed. The final product, then, is the formation of a process of mutual conversion, socialization of new members, reinforcement of existing values and the emergence of an identifiable cultural phenomenon. Outwardly visible socialization is accompanied by strong inner

conviction. Such consensus is probably the most important criterion of the validity of the frame of reference.

The form deviant subcultures take (here defining the "deviance" from our own comfortable perspective) varies from campus to campus, but where they exist they often appear to have a visibility and influence far beyond their usually small and fluid membership. Their chief significance is that they offer a genuine alternative, if only a temporary one, to the student seeking a distinctive identity in keeping with his own temperamental and experiential needs. The derogatory references often made to "non-conformist conformity," and "phony role playing," should not be permitted to obscure the underlying needs being met nor lead to a disregard for clues to developmental aspects taking place at the various levels of role, role conformity, identity and internalization. Recent work on the assumption of an identity to which the individual is highly motivated (Olesen and Whittaker, 1968) suggests that the very process of taking on the desired role and its incumbent norms and values involves a period when the individual appears to and, indeed, himself feels that he is "playing at" his identity, and a sense of falseness dogs the early stages of socialization.

The two major and well-recognized forms of subcultural deviant behavior in collegiate youth, the political activists, who confront society and demand change, and the disaffiliates, who have withdrawn from conventional social mores and desire to be left alone to savour the manifestations of their own subculture, reflect the "alienation of contemporary youth." Both nonconformist roles have a long socio-historical tradition. Although such feelings are basically universal, a reflection of the human condition, the recent extent of the overt disply of alienation is apparently the result of the inadequately or incompletely accomplished task of attaining adulthood (by traditional standards) and accepting the choices society demands one to make. However, alienation

socially supported by the peer culture acts to absolve many young people of any need for personally accepting conventional adulthood.

The activist and disaffiliate subcultures, both defined as deviant (again, not derogatorily) have a number of characteristics in common. Their value system, as indicated by major themes, is rather similar: Romanticism (a freer, more adventurous life); Anti-authoritarianism (anti-dogmatism, anti-institutionalism); Egalitarianism; Moral Purity (meaning lack of hypocrisy, and not necessarily stalwart Puritanism); and Humanism (an emphasis on the sanctity of human beings and the need for human relationships). Similarly, group data on the OPI results in very similar profiles for the two subcultures: high intellectual disposition (Tl, TO, Es, Co); low authoritarianism (high Au, RO); somewhat low social-emotional adjustment with high impulse expression; and low practical outlook (Heist, 1966; Whittaker, 1967a). The ACL need scale, however, differentiated them: activists were higher on Aggression, Exhibition, Dominance and Achievement, although both groups were high on Autonomy and Change and low on Order and Endurance (Whittaker, 1967b).

Of the Center's Fall 1966 freshman sample of 9,000 students on 11 campuses, 18% had been active to some degree in the civil rights and/or anti-war movements and illustrates the extent of the pre-college commitment and socialization that had taken place. Research on the FSM (Watts and Whittaker, 1966) identified the basic socio-biographical differences between activists and students in general that has since been confirmed in other student activist populations (Derber and Flacks, 1967). These students who do not uncritically and inactively accept the status quo tend to be from educationally elite families. Twice as many fathers of FSM students had advanced academic degrees (MAs or PhDs) than did the fathers of students in general (26% to 11%) and four times as many of their mothers had such degrees (16% to 4%). Similarly the FSM students, significantly

tended to be comprised of students with Jewish or no religious affiliation and with Roman Catholics and Protestants under-represented. In terms of majors, the FSM were from the social sciences, humanities and fine arts and not from the more pragmatic fields such as engineering and business administration.

The disaffiliate subculture, compared to students in general at Berkeley, tended to have backgrounds in the humanities and fine arts, and were more estranged from their families physically as well as in terms of values related to intellectual, religious and political beliefs and life styles and future goals (Watts and Whittaker, in press). A socio-emotional maladjustment was indicated but it was not severe. The most common response to social alienation and feelings of anomie is what Riesman called "privatism." Such alienated young people increasingly emphasize and value precisely those areas of their lives which are least involved in the wider society, and which therefore seem most manageable and controllable. Along with this response is a search for self via a kind of cult of sense experience. Displaying a high need for change and tolerance for ambiguity coupled with an exceptionally high capacity for impulse expression, often in conjunction with a lack of defensive caution, the disaffiliate youth is particularly prone to experiment with, and use, drugs. Yolles (1968) and many others have been concerned about the proportion of the current generation reaching adulthood embittered towards, or withdrawn from, the larger society and unequipped to take on the parental, vocational and other citizen roles which seem to make traditional society possible, as well as being involved in varying degrees of socially deviant behavior, in particular, using drugs with unknown long term effects.

Becker (1968) recently stated re campus drug usage that some kind of implicit bargain might be struck between university administrators and student

drug users, a bargain, he suggests, not unlike the one that seems to characterize homosexuality on most college campuses. All large campuses have such an underground of both students and faculty, yet administrations seldom seem to become unduly anxious about this problem and almost never make a big public outcry about it because they have come to terms with the fact that they cannot do anything about it and, therefore, dangerous as they may regard it, live with it. In effect the deviant community and the university administration have made an unspoken bargain. Homosexuals agree to keep things within limits - particularly out of the eye of the general public - and the administration agrees to not look for trouble. The ethic of "live and let live" prevails.

This strikes Becker as the most likely "solution" to the problem of campus drug use and a procedure already in effect. Administrators must take a calmer view of drug use, and students must become more cautious. The reaction to his statement, however, resulted in numerous officials inthe area of medicine and education disagreeing strongly with his position. One is led to wonder what the consensus is among deans of students.

Social Change

Many of the outlooks and values of America's alienated youth - the activists and the disaffiliates - can be seen as responses to the traditional matter of perceived and desired change and existing social rigidity. It is a basic precept to students of social change that a forerunner to the shift of social values is some degree of deviation or innovation and conflict. Only the deviator can introduce fundamentally new ways into the culture. Since war, racism, poverty and bureaucratic superstructuring are widely acknowledged to be serious problems far from solution, it hardly seems logical that student idealism, regardless of its excesses, should be stifled. In this respect more than one

outspoken critic of social science researchers probing in the area of youth has felt emphasis should be upon the social ills and maladjustment of our society as the underlying cause of student troubles and, as they forcefully put it, "quit focussing on student characteristics and behavior."

The difficulty may lie in the discrepant vision of the future roles traditionalist adults and alienated youth apparently see or feel. It is assumed by most of us that the kind of adulthood which is being prepared for can be described in familiar terms - e.g., a notion of adulthood which is measured by commitment or identification with a fixed galaxy of demands and dependencies. The alternative is to conceive of an adulthood whose properties may be deduced from the youth culture which presumably functions to nurture it - an adulthood which is adequate for the future world which calls it into being and which itself is being molded in the caucuses of student cultures, and an adulthood and society of quite a different kind than that for which present educational institutions are structured and for which they prepare individuals. If society is to be defined as being in a constant state of change, an appropriate adulthood is defined by its capacity to relate to change. Commitment and identity need to be reinterpreted to suit a world in motion.[2]

Gide (1921) passionately championed the cause of youth: "I believe the truth lies in youth. I believe it is always right and against us. I believe that, far from trying to teach it, it is from youth that we, the elders, must seek our lessons. And I am well aware that youth is capable of errors but I believe that often, when we try to protect youth, we impede it. Each new generation may arrive bearing a message that it must deliver. Our role is

---

[2] This paragraph is an extraction from notes made by M. Rossman, a student activist, while serving his jail sentence in connection with the FSM (1967).

listen and act upon it." And furthermore, whether you think it an optimistic or pessimistic prediction, Davis (1967) argues the point that all of us may be hippies someday.

The question can be raised whether new educational institutions need to, or can, be designed to nurture these new types of personalities. The answers are surely inherent in the present characteristics of youth if we can hear them. Interestingly, Canada has come to some kind of grip with the issue by encouraging a loosely structured group, the Company of Young Canadians. These youth are paid by the federal government to rock the establishment boat. Similarly a youth who, on his own, has embarrassed and bugged the civic government of Canada's third largest city, has received a federal grant enabling him to continue his work much to the chagrin of the city's mayor.

All of this suggests that more of our youthful activists and disaffiliates need recognition and a share of the power. Our institutions could tolerate and live with it, possibly with beneficial results. This appears to be very much the case in higher education. In your thinking about innovation I hope students, particularly those unable to accept the status quo, will be kept in mind and given due consideration. Perhaps, basically, those discussed as the "untouched," the silent middle, will eventually prove the greater educational problem.

References

Austin, James, Lucas, John and Montgomery, James R., College Roommates: A Study of Interaction and Resulting Performance. Office of Institutional Research, Univ. of Tennessee. Paper presented at Assoc. for Inst. Res. Annual Forum and published in Forum Proceedings, May 6-9, 1968, San Francisco.

Becker, Howard S. "Ending Campus Drug Incidents," Trans-Action, April 1968, p.4-5.

Casebeer, A.L., "Student democratic values within various administrative climates of selected colleges and universities," Dissert. Abst., 24, 3161, 1963.

Centra, John A., "Studies of Institutional Environments: Categories of Instrumentation and Some Issues," paper presented at Assoc. for Inst. Res. Annual Forum, and published in Forum Proceedings, May 6-9, 1968, S.F.

Clark, B.R. and Trow, M., "Determinants of College Student Subcultures," unpublished manuscript, Center for the Study of Higher Education, Berkeley, California, 1960.

——— "The Organizational Context," in College Peer Groups, ed. by Newcomb, T.M. and Wilson, E.K. Chicago, Aldine, 1966, pp. 17-70.

Cross, P., "Student Values Revisited," The Research Reporter, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley, California, Vol.3, Nov. 68, p.2-5.

Davis, Fred, "Why all of Us may be Hippies Someday," Trans-action, December, 1967, pp.10-18.

Derber, Charles and Flacks, Richard, "An Exploration of the Value System of Radical Student Activists and their Parents," paper presented at the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, California, 1967.

Duggan, John M., "What Difference does College Make?" Educ. Testing Service, Paper presented at Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems, San Francisco, May 68.

Erikson, E.H., "The problems of ego identity," in Identity and the Life Cycle, Psychological Issues, 1, 1959.

Farwell, E.D., Warren, J.R., and McConnell, T.R., "Student personality characteristics associated with groups of colleges and fields of study," mimeographed, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1961.

Freedman, M., "The passage through college," in N. Sanford (ed) Personality development during the college years, J.soc. Issues, 1956, 12, 13-38.

Gaff, Jerry G., "Environmental Assessment of an Innovative Cluster College," paper presented at Assoc. for Inst. Res. Annual forum and published in Forum Proceedings, May 1968, San Francisco.

Heilbrun, A.B., "Personality differences between adjusted and maladjusted college students," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 341-346.

——— "Prediction of first year college dropouts, using ACL need scales," J.Counsel. psychol., 1962, 9, 58-63.

Heist, P., "Student values and the academic life," edited version of an article published in Northwest College Personnel Association Newsletter, 1961.

Heist, "The Dynamics of Student Discontent and Protest," mimeographed, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley, California, 1966.

Hendrix, Vernon L., "Junior College Environment Scales," paper presented at Assoc. for Inst. Res. Annual Forum and published in Forum Proceedings, May 1968, San Francisco.

Hopper, E.I., "A conceptual system for the classification of educational systems," paper for the sociology of education, 6th World Congress of Sociology, Evian, France, 1966.

Jacob, P., Changing Values in College, New York, Harper, 1957.

Kells, H.R., "A Significant Problem deserving Study: The Cluster College," paper presented at Assoc. for Inst. Res. Annual Forum and published in Forum Proceedings, May, 1968, San Francisco.

Keniston, K, The Uncommitted, New York, Harcourt, 1965.

Mason, E.P., Adams, H.L., Blood, D.F., "Further Study of Personality Characteristics of Bright College Freshmen," April 1968, unpublished manuscript, Western Washington State College.

Mauss, A.L., "Toward an Empirical Typology of Junior College Student Subcultures," paper read at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, Long Beach, California, March, 1967.

McConnell T.R. and Heist, P., "The diverse college student population," in Sanford, N. (ed.) The American College, Wiley, New York, 1961.

Newcomb, T.M., et al, Persistence and Change: Bennington College and Its Students After 25 Years, New York, Wiley, 1967.

Newcomb, T.M., and Feldman, K.A., "Interpersonal experiences: student culture and faculty," Chapter 8 in The Impacts of Colleges Upon their Students, a report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, January, 1968.

Newcomb, T.M. and Wilson, E.K., College Peer Groups, Chicago, Aldine, 1966.

Olesen, Virginia and Whittaker, Elvi Waik, The Silent Dialogue: A Study in the Social Psychology of Professional Socialization, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Pemberton, W.A., Ability, Values and College Achievement, Newark, Delaware, U. of Delaware, 1963.

Regan, Mary C. and Yonge, George D., "Student Subcultures and Personality Change," CERA, March 1968, Berkeley.

Stanfield, R.E. and Schumer, H., "Pre-College Environment and Anticipated Role Orientations in College," paper read at AERA, Chicago, Feb., 1968.

Tonnies, Ferdinand, Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft (1st Ed., 1887), trans. and ed. by Loomis, Charles P., as Fundamental Concepts of Sociology, New York, American Book Co., 1940.

Warren, J.R., "Student Perceptions of College Subcultures," American Educational Research Journal, 5,2, March, 1968, pp 213-232.

Watts, W.A. and Whittaker, D., "Free Speech Advocates at Berkeley," J. of Applied Behav. Science, 2, Jan-Mar, 1966, pp. 41-62.

Watts, W.A. and Whittaker, D., "Students of Life," paper read for the Research Group on the Sociology of Education at the Sixth World Congress of Sociology, Evian, France, Sept., 1966. To be published in Journal of Sociology of Education.

Whittaker, D., "Psychological Characteristics of Alienated, Nonconformist, College-Age Youth as Indicated by AVL, OPI, ACL and SVIB M/W Profiles," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1967a.

Whittaker, D. and Watts, W.A., "Psychological Needs and Nonconformity," paper read at 11th Interamerican Congress of Psychology, Mexico City, December, 1967b. Published in Proceedings of the I.C.P.

Yolles, S.F., in "Drugs and Alienation - An Urgent Warning," San Francisco Chronicle, May 7, 1968.